REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of June 22, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1-3, 17 and 21 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendments can be found at least from page 9, lines 27-28.

This response is submitted after the filing of a Notice of Appeal, which was filed on September 25, 2007, and with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Specification and Drawing

Regarding the objection to the disclosure in section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the Amendment after Final filed July 17, 2007, in which the specification and drawings were amended to overcome the objection. Applicant respectfully submits that entry of the these amendments is appropriate since this response is submitted along with an RCE. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of entry of the amendments to the specification and drawings.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 5, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 10-13 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Chua (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0183833). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Chua, because Chua fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite an input component configured to receive an analog user input to be recognized, and a recognition component configured to analyze the analog user input. Applicant respectfully submits that Chua at least fails to disclose or suggest these limitations recited in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Chua discloses a keyboard (20) capable of detecting a touch at a selected position (52). See Chua paragraph [0025]. A user touches a screen (12) at the point (52), shown by an X in Figure 3. See Chua paragraph [0024]. The point (52) corresponds to a discrete, i.e. digital input by the user. Horizontal and vertical sensors (32, 34) pass the selected

position to a driver circuit (36). A processor (38) makes decisions and causes the display to be updated with a new symbol, i.e. letter, and a list of other candidate symbols or a list of candidate words. However, Chua does not disclose or suggest receiving and analyzing an <u>analog input,</u> because Chua only receives a <u>discrete</u> input at the selected position (52). This selected position corresponds to a discrete point on the keyboard (20), and accordingly is only a digital input. Therefore, Chua does not disclose or suggest receiving and analyzing analog inputs, for example handwriting or voice, because the system in Chua is only configured to receive and analyze a single digital input. For at least this reason, Chua fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 17 and 21 contain limitations similar to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 17 and 21 are not disclosed or suggested by Chua.

The dependent claims rejected above, all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by Chua at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 6, on page 6 of the Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chua in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,306). Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1, and Lewis fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Chua identified above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

In section 7, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 5-6, 8-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chua in view of Lyon (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,621). Claims 5-6, 8-9 and 14-16 all ultimately depend from an independent claim, and Lyon fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Chua identified above. Therefore, the claims are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 8, on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chua in view of Lyon, and in further view of Lewis. Claim 7 ultimately

depends from independent claim 1, and Lyon and Lewis fail to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Chua identified above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fee deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _11 December 2007_

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955